



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box. 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 09/833,766 | 04/13/2001 | Keiji Emoto | 862.C2199 | 4154 | |
| 5514 | 7590 04/21/2004 | | EXAMI | NER | |
| FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO | | | RODRIGUE | RODRIGUEZ, PAUL L | |
| 30 ROCKEFE NEW YORK. | ELLER PLAZA NY 10112 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | , | | 2125 | 12 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 04/21/2004 | 12 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

&

| | Application No. | licant(s) |
|---|---|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/833,766 | емото, кеілі |
| Ť | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Paul L Rodriguez | 2125 |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address |
| THE REPLY FILED 4/2/04 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which | ation. A proper reply to a |
| PERIOD FOR RE | EPLY [check either a) or b)] | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officitimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI of extension and the corresponding amounth that the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail | g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF | R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | ecause: | |
| (a) they raise new issues that would require further | er consideration and/or search (s | see NOTE below); |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b | elow); | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or | n better form for appeal by mate | rially reducing or simplifying the |
| (d) they present additional claims without cancelli NOTE: | ng a corresponding number of fi | nally rejected claims. |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | ion(s): | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | be allowable if submitted in a se | parate, timely filed amendment |
| 5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: See | | dered but does NOT place the |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ause it is not directed SOLELY to | o issues which were newly |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3,5-11,26 and 37-39</u> . | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 12-14,27-3 | <u>6 and 40</u> . | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr | roved or b) disapproved by t | he Examiner. |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer | nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | , |
| 10. Other: | | Jane Allas |
| | | Paul L Rodriguez Examiner Art Unit: 2125 |







Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the outer surface of the pipe is exposed to a vacuum atmosphere. The apparatus of Fukasawa et al is in a clean room and some clean rooms operate in a vacuum atmosphere such as U.S. Pat 4,838,150 which creates a vacuum pressure using an exhaust means, Merriam-Webster defines vacuum a a space partially exhausted by artificial means. Applicant argues that the references provide no suggestion of the problem in degassing which the structure claimed is designed to solve. While the structure may be designed to solve this problem, the claims lack language addressing specifically a degassing problem. Applicant argues that the references are silent to the problem of a disturbance to the stage by the pipe action, again the claims lack such language.